
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE restless march of Biblical science is continually springing fresh surprises. Conclusions in which we had begun to settle comfortably are being challenged by new discoveries or new interpretations of familiar facts, and many 'assured results' are being rudely shaken. The critics have recently compelled us to reconsider the date of Deuteronomy and the origin of the Psalter—matters on which twenty or thirty years ago there was comparative unanimity; and now comes the turn of Deutero-Isaiah.

Or rather 'the Second Isaiah'; for, with the magnanimity of true scholarship, Professor C. C. TORREY, of Yale University, in his recently published *The Second Isaiah: a New Interpretation* (T. & T. Clark; 15s. net), confesses his preference for the simpler name, 'inasmuch as the prophecy belongs to the man in the street quite as truly as to the scholar in his study.' By Deutero-Isaiah we used to understand the whole of the latter part of the book, from ch. 40 to ch. 66, till Duhm taught us to confine the term to chs. 40 to 55 and to regard chs. 56 to 66 as a separate work written in the century after the Exile, within which the earlier chapters fall. This is the now generally accepted position, the only point at issue being whether the last eleven chapters should be regarded as an original literary unit or a collection of fragments.

Now Professor TORREY comes upon the scene with a 'new interpretation' which shatters to pieces the prevalent conception of the origin and meaning of the book. He has found it necessary, he tells us, 'in every chapter to controvert the views now universally accepted, showing their inadequacy and explaining the author's intention.' In his 'Ezra Studies,' published eighteen years ago, Dr. TORREY showed his quality as an admirable Semitic scholar with a challenging mind and a more than usually unconventional outlook, and his new book is marked by the same freshness and audacity of treatment. A scholar who can assign the building of Nehemiah's wall to 384 B.C. (p. 110) and the Book of Ezekiel to 230 B.C. (p. 101) does not lack courage. The same courage and originality are evidenced in his treatment of the post-exilic age, which he refuses to regard as an age of decadence and degeneracy. 'The period was one of steady advance, not deterioration, in culture, literature, and religion. . . . This was the golden age of the national poetry, as well as of prophecy' (p. 89).

Besides breadth of scholarship and freshness of mind, Dr. TORREY brings to his task a fine literary sense and a keen appreciation of the literary qualities of the book, alike on its technical and its deeper side. There is a truly refreshing chapter on 'Reconstruction by Meter and Strophe,' in which he holds up to ridicule the liberties which Old Testament scholars have often taken with the text, emending, supplementing, rewriting it, in accordance with views of Hebrew metre which are

often anything but certain and may even be false.

The peril of emending poetry on the basis of too rigid ideas of the principles governing its metrical demands is illustrated by a finely satirical reconstruction of 'Crossing the Bar,' accompanied by some amusing mimicry of the argumentation commonly employed by critics. Subjected to this treatment, the third verse emerges thus :

> Twilight at first, and evening bell,
> And after that the dark !
> And may there be no sad farewell,
> When I at last embark.

This is more than clever ; it is illuminating.

Without appreciation there can be no true criticism, and Professor TORREY also brings this indispensable quality to his discussion. He can scarcely find terms strong enough to express his admiration for 'the Second Isaiah,' whether as poet or prophet. He is 'the greatest prophet of the ancient world' (p. 218), 'one of the greatest men of antiquity' (p. 39), 'also a born poet, and in his own sphere he is supreme and unrivalled among the great poets of the world' (p. 91). His book is not only 'beyond question the greatest and most original specimen of Hebrew poetry, or of Hebrew prophecy, that has come down to us' (p. 52), but 'the greatest single poetical work of any age' (p. x), and 'a landmark in the history of human thought' (p. 134).

Obviously a man so equipped as Professor TORREY with scholarship, historical sense, literary feeling, and religious insight has a right to be heard when he challenges current critical opinion. He challenges that opinion at every point. He does not believe that chs. 56–66 should be separated from chs. 40–55, but that together, prefaced by chs. 34 and 35, they form a homogeneous whole, issued at one time and in one volume, and composed in the order in which they now stand. He does not believe that the so-called 'Songs of the Servant of Jahweh' are independent and separable from their context, but that each is 'part and parcel of the chapter in which it stands.' Above all, he does not believe that even chs. 40–48—still less chs. 49–55, which contain no direct or indirect allusion to Cyrus, or to any particular land of exile—were written in Babylon in the sixth century B.C., near the close of the so-called 'Babylonian exile' (540 B.C.), or that they have for their principal themes the glorification of Cyrus, and the Return of the Jews from Babylonia to Jerusalem.

This, it will be admitted, is a sufficiently drastic challenge. What he does believe is that the Second Isaiah composed these poems—all of them, chs. 34 f., 40–66—'not long after the year 407 ; we may take for convenience the round number 400 B.C.' (p. 109); that they were written in Palestine, presumably in Jerusalem, at a time when the Second Temple had long been in existence and the people were there maintaining the ancient forms of their cult, however unworthily and half-heartedly; and that 'the people whom he addresses are in their own land, and there is in his words no hint that they, or any portion of them, have ever been anywhere else' (p. 53).

As we call to mind the definite allusions in the prophecy to Cyrus and Babylon on which the case rests for the Babylonian origin and the date about 540 B.C., we stare with astonishment and ask on what authority evidence so palpable is to be dismissed. It is in his treatment of this point that Professor TORREY goes his entirely new way. He believes that all these allusions are later interpolations—the allusions to Cyrus in 44^{28} (which is in any case admittedly an overloaded verse) and 45^{1}, and the allusions to Babylon and Chaldea in 43^{14} 48^{14} and 48^{20}. Undoubtedly the excision of Babylon and the Chaldeans greatly improves and clarifies 43^{14}, which Dr TORREY renders, 'For your sake I will send and bring all the fugitives, exulting, in their ships'—the reference to the 'ships' (which many scholars needlessly emend) suggesting that the Jewish exiles are not in Babylon, but in places from which they could return to Judea by sea. In point of fact, it cannot be denied that more than once the people are represented as settled all over the world, in the east, west, north, and south

(cf. $43^{5f.}$). In other words, it is the later Dispersion, not the Babylonian exile, that the prophet has in view, and the most fitting description of him is 'the Prophet of the Dispersion.'

This is the calamity which had brought dismay to every loyal son of Israel—not the deportation of a few thousand Jews to Babylonia, but the dispersion of the nation to the four corners of the world, with the consequent danger of its assimilation to idolatrous practices and of the frustration of Israel's mission. The prophet is really combating the threatened dissolution of Israel.

But the reason which makes it certain that those proper names which point so definitely to a Babylonian origin are intrusions is based on metrical considerations: the suspected words interfere with the metre. In 45^{1}, for example, the word *l'Kōresh* (*to Cyrus*), on which our whole interpretation of the Second Isaiah turns, is metrically superfluous, as a glance at Cheyne's edition of the Hebrew is enough to show. So argues Professor TORREY; and for the same reason the other proper names fall under the same suspicion.

There can be no doubt that this argument compels a reconsideration of the problem of the book. It is also strengthened by the fact, on which Dr. TORREY justly enough lays stress (p. 42), that explanatory interpolations do undoubtedly occur elsewhere in the Old Testament: for example, in Is $7^{17.\ 20}$ 'the king of Assyria' is a manifest intrusion. But two considerations give us pause. It is surely unfortunate when interpreters feel themselves obliged to tamper with the received text of a word which is crucial for the interpretation of the passage: this justifies the hesitation in accepting Duhm's brilliant emendation of 'Chaldeans' in Hab 1^{6}, by which the prophecy is transformed into a denunciation of Alexander the Great. And, again, Dr. TORREY himself admits that 'the first principles of Hebrew metric form are not yet thoroughly understood' (p. 82). In that case we may perhaps be permitted to suspend our judgment.

Dr. TORREY, however, does not rest his case merely on the fact that the 'Cyrus-exile' element is, as he puts it, 'dabbed on' (p. 40), but on the far more important consideration that, if Cyrus be retained, the message of the prophecy seems to be involved in inextricable confusion. That message, broadly, is that God's glorious purpose of salvation for the world is to be realized through His Servant, who is primarily Israel but possibly also some great representative of Israel. It happens, however, that phrases are applied and a mission ascribed to Cyrus which are elsewhere applied and ascribed to the Servant. Are we to suppose, then, that Cyrus is the Servant? 'The confusion,' argues Professor TORREY, 'is intolerable. We are faced with an alternative. God's chosen instrument, the centre of this whole prophecy, is either Cyrus or Israel; it cannot possibly be both.' We confess we do not find this argument entirely satisfactory. Why may not Cyrus be the instrument through whom Jahweh enables Israel, through her deliverance from bondage, to win an overwhelming experience of His power and saving purpose, like that which their fathers won at the Exodus, an experience to which the prophet recurs again and again?

The thing of central importance, however, which constitutes the Second Isaiah 'a great landmark in the history of the world's religious thought' (p. 118) is his emphasis on the inclusion of the whole Gentile world, side by side with Israel, in the family of the One God. This is the 'new thing,' according to Dr. TORREY, which the prophet repeatedly professes to announce—not the historical emancipation of Israel from Babylon, but the salvation of the Gentiles through the ministration of the Servant; and this is the real consummation of the eternal purpose of God, initiated historically in the call of Abraham ($41^{8f.}$) and achieved through His Servant. No such magnanimous programme had ever been published before.

But who is the Servant? This is the question uppermost in the minds of all students of the Second Isaiah, and the chapter in which it is discussed is not likely to convince those who are firmly per-

suaded that the Servant in the so-called Songs, as in the prophecy proper, is to be interpreted collectively. The use of the term 'Servant,' Dr. TORREY admits, is perplexing, and the figure is not always the same; it is sometimes the personified nation, sometimes Israel's personal representative. Of the existence of a personal leader as distinguished from the group Dr. TORREY has no doubt. 'Out of this personification of the ideal Israel of the future there emerges the figure of a great leader, the Anointed One. Such a teacher and champion there must be, the future is unthinkable without him.' But if the First Isaiah in 1^{26} could conceive the future without such an individual leader, may not also the Second? At any rate, if we put a personal interpretation on the 'Servant Songs,' it seems easier to believe that they are not from the hand that wrote the body of the prophecy, where the interpretation must be collective, than that Songs and prophecy are from the same hand and that the figure of the Servant changes.

But whatever criticisms may be made on Dr. TORREY'S book in detail or as a whole, it is a splendid challenge to contemporary critical opinion. In the exegesis which follows a very careful translation, and which covers nearly half the book, he justly claims to be contributing 'much that is totally new.' There are many points both in the exegetical detail and in the broad discussion which scholars will not be slow to challenge. But they will gladly recognize that here is the work of a master who can think for himself, who has stirred fresh problems, and who has made a notable contribution to contemporary Biblical scholarship.

The story of the Unjust Steward has always been a crux in New Testament exposition. The traditional interpretation, that Jesus was commending prudence in religion, offends many people. And numerous efforts have been made to give the story another turn. The latest of these, by Mr. Frank LENWOOD, appears in the current *Congregational Quarterly*, and it is certainly original.

Mr. LENWOOD echoes most of the objections that have been made to the ordinary view. Is it probable that Jesus would have drawn a lesson of the need for holy prudence from a story in which the arresting impression is one of fraud? To which one might answer, Why not? Presumably Jesus meant to say, 'If only you would put as much thought into your religion as a business man puts into his business, even a bad business man into a bad business, you would make a greater success of it.' And why should not Jesus say that? The honesty or dishonesty is irrelevant.

Another criticism is that it is improbable in the extreme that the master who suffered from a fraud would give it praise. Again, Why not? Can we not imagine a master smiling ruefully as he considered how he had been 'done,' and saying, 'Well, he's a clever beggar; if only he had turned his talents in the right direction he would have done well for himself.' And notice, the steward is not let off. He receives his punishment. The master says, 'Well, he's smart; but he must go through with it.'

A drastic criticism is also made on the doctrine implied in the story, that the wise use of money here can make it easier for us in the hereafter. 'No use of money can give heaven. . . . Can the friends who have profited by your use of wealth open to you the hospitality of heaven? Is not that God's business? To unlock the heavenly doors you need His invitation, not merely that of the recipients of your past bounties.'

To this the answer is surely very plain. In the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which follows, the whole point is just what is objected to in our present story, that the proper use of wealth, or the abuse of it, made all the difference to the Rich Man's future. As a doctrine this may be objected to, but that it is our Lord's teaching, not only in the Unjust Steward but elsewhere, is beyond question. Why, then, cavil at it here? Jesus teaches clearly that our conduct here determines our future happiness. Witness the Parable of

the Talents and the great discourse in Mt 25, and often elsewhere.

A last criticism is concerned with the verses Lk $16^{10ff.}$ which are appended to the Parable. This is not really a difficulty about the Parable, because they may easily have been added by St. Luke himself. But the objection that the words about faithfulness in little and in much are irrelevant does not seem formidable. Why should not Jesus have said, 'Here was a man who was unfaithful to his trust; you at any rate are not to be like that'? The real difficulty, however, is that this is not the point of the story. The story commends prudence in religion, not faithfulness. And it is quite likely that St. Luke added the words on his own account.

Mr. LENWOOD, however, feels the difficulties mentioned almost insurmountable, and he suggests another reading. The Parable is really a criticism of Pharisaism. The Pharisees were God's stewards. Fearing a loss of power and anxious to hold their followers, they made concessions as against the strict law such as involved an immoral cheapening of God's demand. Jesus ironically praises them because at such manœuvres they are so much nimbler than the real children of God.

The Parable was not addressed to the disciples. God is the master and His demands are heavy. So heavy are they, according to the Pharisaic code, that human nature offers a passive obstruction. In face of this it was increasingly difficult for the Pharisees to hold their position. And in facing this difficulty they did what all legalists do—they made dispensations and offered accommodations in order to retain power for their system.

Jesus was aiming His criticisms at the elaborate fabric of Jewish casuistry, of which we have many examples in the Gospels. The Sabbath law and the law of Corban are good instances. The result was a moral confusion which obscured real moral values. What Jesus says therefore to the Pharisees is this: 'He was a prudent fellow, that bailiff, and so are you! We who live by the light of God cannot keep up with you there. But your accommodations depend on a betrayal of the demand of God and are a denial of your stewardship.'

The difficulties in the way of this interpretation are very obvious. For one thing, it is too subtle. You have to strain your mind to carry it through. For another, it is quite hopeless on this view to give any reasonable interpretation of verse 9, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when it shall fail they may receive you into eternal tabernacles.' And, finally, St. Luke tells us the story was told to the disciples, not to the Pharisees.

In the analysis of the scientific and the religious attitudes contained in Mr. Carl RAHN'S recent book on *Science and the Religious Life* (reviewed in another column) there is a chapter on 'The Control of Psychophysiological Processes' which may be of interest to the Christian expositor. Having indicated that control of experience and of our behaviour depends on our knowledge of the usual stimulus for a given response, and becomes still more certain when we know also the general conditions that tend to raise, or lower, the threshold for the release of the given response, he goes on to say that the records of the religious experience, especially in the later stages of culture, are found to offer, besides theologies and cosmologies, suggestions towards a technique of psycho-physiological control.

We have been so preoccupied with the theological and cosmological implications of the religious experience that we have been apt to lose sight of this material. Yet it exists in rich abundance, and constitutes a field that awaits proper scientific investigation. The insight into the principles of psycho-physiological functioning which it reveals will often be seen to anticipate our contemporary scientific accounts. Nor is it surprising that this should be so when we consider how mankind has concentrated upon the spiritual quest, and in particular upon the development of personality and character through self-discipline.

For example, the psychological bearing of the practice of fasting, so frequently recommended in ancient days, is often completely missed. The evidence shows that fasting tends to limber up the mental processes and to allay the neuro-muscular tensions, and thus to create conditions which might give a chance for a new mode of psychophysiological functioning. Indeed, fasting might affect not only the individual's perception and judgment, but also his organic reactions and his overt behaviour. 'These implications of our contemporary scientific knowledge of fasting might, if we were so minded, lead us into some sort of intellectual appreciation, if not of the objective of the spiritual quest, at least of the *rationale* of one of the means that have sometimes been proposed for its attainment.'

Again, the religious traditions and records under consideration indicate much in the way of concrete knowledge of the factors that condition the affective or emotional life. Thomas à Kempis may be said to reveal a profound insight into the interrelationships of psychological and physiological processes in his instructions to the neophyte, based on the text in 1 John, 'Perfect love casteth out fear,' a text which may be regarded as offering a significant piece of knowledge of an empirical sort. For it implies not only a qualitative difference between the 'adrenalistic' state of fear and the 'anabolic' state of love, but also a functional opposition between these states. And it is only in recent years that 'the possibility of the existence of well-defined anabolic mechanisms operative in certain emotive states is being envisaged psychologically,' and much of the envisagement is as yet one-sided.

Or consider such a counsel as 'Love your enemies.' Taken in its purely outward meaning, it does not always receive the approval of common sense; and yet it builds on a firm physiological basis: the body is poisoned by hatred and its energy is wasted in anger. In thus pointing to the control of the 'catabolic' states and to the release of the 'anabolic' reaction, this counsel indicates the possibility of remaking the human individual at the physiological centre of being, namely, 'at the point of those organic processes whose functioning determines the life of values and attitudes, of desires and purposes.'

Or consider such an instruction as 'Be still.' Just as the practice of fasting looks beyond inhibition of certain physiological processes, so this instruction looks beyond arrest of the mental life. To put to rest the questioning of the mind is no mere negative process. 'It may arise spontaneously in the individual, as in certain forms of religious awakening, or it may be inaugurated by him as part of a technique of control; but however brought about, the elimination that it involves of the state of secondary attention with its many foci and with its conflict of many impulses, apparently constitutes a condition for inducing widespread modification of mental and bodily processes.'

All this may be vaguely put and difficult to understand. But it is interesting to notice this correlation of religion and science, and that both religion and science may be regarded as pointing in the direction of the possibility of some radical psychophysiological change in our humanity.

'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' (Hos 6^{6}). This short, sharp sentence is among the most significant in the Bible. In it we may find *a motto for the teaching of the Hebrew prophets in general.* Two views are held by students of the Old Testament as to the relation of the prophets to the customary worship. Some say that they condemn worship and sacrifice, and would away with all religious symbols. Others say that they condemn worship and sacrifice only if these are regarded as a substitute for practical piety. In the one case the prophets appear in the rôle of destroyers, of abolitionists; in the other case in the rôle of reformers.

Whatever the truth of the matter may be, on this we may be quite clear—that the prophets look to the moral sphere of character and conduct rather than to the ceremonial sphere for the expression of the true spirit of worship. The obedience which

God requires is not the outward obedience of ceremonial worship and piety, but rather the inward obedience of hearts and lives dedicated to His service. The sacrifices in which God is well pleased are justice and mercy and a humble walk with God.

But in the incisive utterance before us we may also find *a motto for the teaching of Hosea himself.* For the word translated 'mercy' (חֶסֶד) is Hosea's favourite word. Its primary meaning is love Divine, the love of God for His people; that is, according to Hosea, the love shown by God to Israel in the time of her espousals, when, finding her like grapes in the wilderness, like the first-fruit on a fig-tree in its first season, He chose her for Himself from among all the nations of the earth, leading her safe out of the house of captivity and bondage, and through all the wanderings of the wilderness, into the land of promise. And to Hosea's mind that primal love of God for His people was an earnest and token of God's unchanging love.

This great truth of the unchanging and unceasing love of God was borne in upon Hosea's soul—to adopt the usual interpretation of his obscure story—through a dark and bitter passage of experience. The bride of his choice, in whom he had hoped to find his dearest sanctuary on earth, proved herself unworthy and untrue. She returned at length to her lovers. But he found her again, and took her back—'a lily torn and trampled in the mire'—to his heart and home. And this experience of his, all grievous as it was, provided him with a clue to the character of eternal God. As he had loved and cherished Gomer, so the Lord had shed His exceeding great love upon the nation of His choice; and as he had sought Gomer out and redeemed her from her degradation, so the Lord still longed for His faithless people of Israel, pursuing them continually with His gracious favour.

Although Hosea's fundamental thought of God's love for His people is the primary meaning of חֶסֶד, this is obviously not expressed in the verse under consideration. But it gives fulness and richness of content to the derivative meanings that there receive expression. There the word translated 'mercy' means love to God and love to man; and, in Hosea's conception, love to God and love to man are inspired by God's own love. When Hosea bids his countrymen offer the sacrifice of love—of love to God and man—it is unto Him who for ever seeks, unchangingly and unweariedly, to draw them to Himself with the bands of love.

We may also find in the verse before us, if not the key-note, at least *a dominant note of our Lord's teaching.* In this matter of the relation of the ceremonial and the moral His standpoint was the general standpoint of the prophets. The true worship of Him who is Spirit is worship in spirit. And in fulfilling His prophetic mission our Lord found it needful, like the prophets of old, to raise His voice against merely formal religion. Never did an Amos, an Isaiah, or a Micah lash his countrymen more mercilessly than did Jesus the Pharisees of His day, those blind guides, those whited sepulchres, that generation of vipers.

And further, while our Lord's teaching was in line with the general teaching of the prophets, it had special affinity with the teaching of Hosea. Twice it is recorded in the Gospels that our Lord bade the learned Pharisees go and learn the meaning of the Scripture, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice'; that is, according to our interpretation, 'I will have love to God and man and not,' or, 'rather than sacrifice.' And the evangelistic record of our Lord's conversation with one of the scribes is almost like an exposition of this Scripture, 'Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God, and there is none other but He; and to love Him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbour as himself is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.'

It should be easier for Christians than it was for Israel of old to obey the injunction of 'mercy,' that is, of love to God and one's neighbour. Israel had a Hosea, no doubt, to tell her of the Divine

love, and even in his life to reflect it. But Christians have One who in His own Person reflects or reveals the Divine love truly and completely. That was a great sentence of St. Augustine's—great in its simplicity: 'It was mainly for this purpose that Christ came, to wit, that man might know how much God loves him; and that he might learn this, to the intent that he might be enkindled to the love of Him by whom he was first loved, and might also love his neighbours.'

Leaders of Theological Thought.

Karl Barth.

By Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., Edinburgh.

The present-day movement in theology which evokes the deepest interest, alike in friend and foe, is incontestably that associated with the name of Professor Karl Barth. Especially in Germany the controversy is acute.

Barth was born at Basel in 1886 as son of the theological Professor Fritz Barth, known to a former generation as author of a useful book, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, 1903. He went to school in Bern, then studied in the Universities of Bern, Berlin, Tübingen, and Marburg (he speaks of Herrmann as 'my unforgettable teacher'). In 1908–9 he acted as assistant to Dr. Rade, editor of *Die christliche Welt*; for two years thereafter he was Vicar of the German Reformed Congregation in Geneva, and from 1911 to 1921 he held the pastoral charge of Safenwil, Canton Aargau, Switzerland. In the winter of 1921 he was called to Göttingen as Professor of Reformed Theology, and since 1925 he has occupied the Chair of Theology in Münster, Westphalia. Barth is a Swiss, and the movement led by him is often described as 'the Swiss School.' Other prominent members of it are Professor Emil Brunner of Zürich, Dr. Gogarten, and Dr. Thurneysen. But in the present short article we shall limit our attention to Barth himself.

'It always embarrasses me a little,' Barth has said, 'to hear people talk so seriously of *my theology*.' It consists, he urges, simply in a point of view. He will not attempt to rival the systematic efforts of thinkers like Ritschl or Troeltsch, but will merely insert a marginal observation, propose a corrective, utter a warning cry. The line of ancestry to which he wishes to belong goes back through Kierkegaard, Luther and Calvin, Paul, Jeremiah. The name conspicuously absent here is that of Schleiermacher. To him Barth is definitely hostile, on the ground that he conceals men's sorest troubles, part of which is their very religion, and that he confuses God and man—in theology the unpardonable sin. Man and his universe are an enigma. 'Over against him stands God, the Impossible confronting the possible, Death life, Eternity time. The solution of the enigma, the answer to the question, the end of the existential trouble is the absolutely new event that the Impossible as such becomes the possible, death becomes life, eternity time, God man.' The theme of theology is not the deification of man but the incarnation of God. We only theologize as we speak of God. Orthodoxy had its faults, but at least it never forgot this fundamental truth; it knew, at all events in principle, what is superfluous and what is vital. We have to submit our minds, as theologians, to the essential voice of the Bible, where in His Word God reveals Himself in a final authority before which we can only kneel in the dust. 'Let God be found true, but every man a liar.' We are playing with the subject unless we fix ourselves upon the scriptural view of God as Creator and Redeemer and hear in the Bible His very accents. Others abide our question, but to God we cannot say 'Why?' Every chapter in Dogmatic, like every sermon, should bear the inscription, 'God speaks,' and *what* He speaks we discover sufficiently and exclusively in the Bible. Its truth has 'the self-evidence of the Revelation which God gives synchronously to the Biblical witnesses and to His people who receive their testimony.' They receive it by the Spirit's impulse. Theology is lost when it steps outside this 'living circle of Scripture and Spirit.'

Barth perhaps gives us less help than we might desire in distinguishing what is the voice of God from what is not. He relates the alleged Divine revelation inadequately to conscience, and takes